IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

MONDAY, THE 19TH FEBRUARY 2007 / 30TH MAGHA 1928

WP(C).No. 2794 of 2007(G)

PETITIONERS:

1. **THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD EMPLOYEES FEDERATION (AITUC),VAZHUTHAKKAD, TRIVANDRUM, REPRESENTED BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY, S.SHAJI KUMAR, WORKING AS JUNIOR SUPERINTENDENT IN THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD.**

2. **SHEILA S., ACCOUNTS OFFICER, THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD, TRICHUR COMMITTEE, JAI HIND MARKET BUILDING, TRICHUR.**

BY ADV. SRI.K.RAMAKUMAR
SRI.T.RAMPRASAD UNNI

RESPONDENTS:

1. **THE STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

2. **THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

3. **THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE, S.R.M. ROAD, ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-18.**

R1 & 2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SHRI.BIJOY CHANDRAN.
R3 BY SHRI.RENIL ANTO, SC, KHWW BOARD.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19/02/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J.

==========

WP(C).No.2794 OF 2007-G.

==========

Dated this the 19th day of February, 2007.

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is a Trade Union representing the employees of the Kerala Headload Workers Welfare Board. The 2nd petitioner is an employee who belongs to the category of Accounts Officer/Deputy Labour Officer. It is contended that the post of Convenors in the Board are to be filled by promoting eligible members belonging to the feeder category of Accounts Officer/Deputy Labour Officer. The grievance of the petitioners is that irregular promotions are ordered overlooking the claims of the Accounts Officers like the 2nd petitioner and despite representations filed by the 2nd petitioner as also by the 1st petitioner Trade Union, the 3rd respondent has not cared to look into the grievance.

2. Heard counsel for the petitioners, Government Pleader for respondents 1 and 2 and Standing Counsel for the 3rd respondent.

3. Counsel for the 3rd respondent was given time to seek instructions from the respondent concerned. But no information useful for the disposal of this case has been

passed on to the counsel for that respondent. Under the circumstances, I do not think that further adjournments need be granted to enable the 3rd respondent to pass on the required information to this Court. Counsel for the petitioners submits that detailed representations evidenced by Exts.P1 and P2 are pending with the 3rd respondent.

4. In the circumstances, I am inclined to dispose of the writ petition by issuing appropriate directions to the respondents.

5. There shall be an order directing the 3rd respondent to consider Exts.P1 and P2 and pass a speaking order in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, in any event within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. The 1st petitioner should produce a copy of the judgment together with a copy of the writ petition before the 3rd respondent, for due compliance.

The writ petition is, therefore, closed.

K.K.DENESAN, JUDGE.

kvs/-